1999 NATIONAL HIV PREVENTION CONFERENCE

Abstract 372

TITLE: Contextualizing Sexual Risk in College to Inform Intervention

AUTHORS: Fry, D. L. (University of Pennsylvania)

BACKGROUND/OBJECTIVES: Considerable resources are allocated by universities to decrease sexual risk, with few programs resulting in significant behavior change, allocate considerable resources. Programs that do change behavior still show high levels of condom less sex even after outreach. The objective of this study was to better inform intervention with baseline data. The contexts of sexual risk were examined, and findings were integrated with student recommendations to improve intervention. Factors that explained why some students maintain prevention behaviors and others do not within twospecific sexual contexts were explored: sex with non-steady partners and sex while intoxicated.

METHODS: 1) A convenience sample of 501 students was surveyed. Outcomes were based on students' recall about their most recent sexual encounter. Explanatory variables included features of the sexual encounter (intoxication, nature of relationship, attributions about the encounter), participant variables, depression, substance abuse, condomuse intentions, and condomuse self-efficacy measures. Univariate odds ratios and explanatory models (both controlling for ex and race) for each outcome were generated through logistic regression. 2) Four focus groups were conducted to supplement survey findings and to collect information and recommendations to improve outreach.

RESULTS: 1) Different factors predicted condomless sex in general, condom less sex in non steady relationships, and condom less sex while intoxicated. Firstyear students were at increased risk, and students who rated themselves as extremely likely to use condoms in the future were at decreased risk across all three contexts. For condom less sex in general, low condomuse self-efficacy was also a risk factor, and depression turned out to be a second protective factor. For condom less sex with a non-steady partner, substance abuse, intoxication at the time of sex, and the perception that sex occurred due to intoxication were all additional risk factors. Among those who had sex while intoxicated, there were no other significant predictors of condom less sex besides year in school and condomuse intentions. 2) Focus groups elaborated on contexts of risk and identified recommendations for prevention, including making intervention more personal and mobilizing friendship networks that share students' social contexts arid their contextual risk factors.

CONCLUSIONS: The survey was used to explore specific contexts of sexual risk in college that are not well understood. Focus groups elaborated on the survey data and provided recommendations for HIV prevention efforts that complement survey findings. The studyesves as a model for using baseline data to design intervention that is well-litted to specific university cultures.

PRESENTER CONTACT INFORMATION

Name: Dana Fry

Address: 289 Greenough Street

Philadelphia, PA 19127

Telephone: (215) 482-5051

E-mail: danafry@dolphin.vpenn.edu